

### ***REMARKS***

This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to this office action of February 7, 2003. It is requested that matters as to form that have not been addressed in this response be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated. Reconsideration, further examination, entry of the above amendments, and allowance is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments which address the points in the Examiner's as follows:

#### ***Examiner Interview***

The applicants thank Examiner Rada for the time spent during the interview of May 12, 2003.

#### ***Rejections -Specification***

The Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to due to its length. In response, the applicant has shortened the Abstract to be less than 150 words. No new matter has been introduced.

#### ***Claim Rejections -35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by LeVasseur. In response the applicant has amended claim 1 to claim an electronic game that allows the player (person) to select the number of dealers that the person will be playing against. LeVasseur does not teach or suggest this system.

Importantly, the disclosed and claimed system uses a single player hand and plays this single player hand against two or more dealer hands. In contrast, LeVasseur teaches the playing of several different rounds in parallel. In other words, player hand one is played against dealer hand one, and player hand two is played against dealer hand two, and so on. Thus the teachings of LeVasseur do not disclose the method taught here.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). MPEP 2131. The electronic user-selected multiple dealer method is not shown in the LeVasseur reference, nor is the method of play where a single player hand is played against multiple dealer hands. Thus, it is submitted that these amendments overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and place the pending claims in condition for allowance.

### ***Claim Rejections -35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103

as being obvious under LeVasseur in view of Vuong `552. Vuong, however does not teach or suggest the use of a player selectable number of dealers, with corresponding dealer hand positions, and wagers. The use of many dealers greatly increases the number of wagers, and thus the productivity of the system. The use of a single player hand simultaneously against multiple dealer hands is not taught or suggested by the references of record. These useful results, by way of the claimed structure, are not fairly taught or suggested by the combination of LeVasseur and Vuong.

Claims 6, 11, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious under LeVasseur in view of Vuong `552 and further in view of Sardarian. Sardarian teaches a bonus and wildcard feature, and does not teach or suggest the use of a player selectable number of dealers, with corresponding dealer hand positions, and wagers. Accordingly, claim 6 is patentably distinguished from the teachings of Sardarian, LeVasseur and Vuong.


### CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that the applicant has placed this application in condition for allowance. Further examination, abeyance of any remaining informalities, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections raised in the Examiner's Office Action is requested. Moreover, it is submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and that allowance of the present application is in order and is

also requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.


Respectfully submitted this day of April, 2003,



Ramon L. Pizarro, Reg. No. 37207  
Attorney for Applicant  
3515 South Tamarac Drive, Suite 200  
Denver, Colorado 80237  
Telephone: (303) 779-9551  
Facsimile: (303) 689-9627

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 9th day of June, 2003.



Ramon L. Pizarro